

De Gaulle's Noble Indignation and the State Dept.'s Effort at An Icy Retort

"We find it totally detestable that a small country should be bombed by a very big one."

—Gen. de Gaulle at his press conference, Oct. 28.

"State Dept. reacted icily yesterday to de Gaulle's advice to withdraw American troops from Vietnam on the

ground that a military victory there is impossible. The General, U.S. officials noted, is a professional military man and apparently thinks about victory only in military terms, which is not an avowed objective of the U.S."

—Associated Press in Washington Post, Oct. 29.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. XIV, NO. 35

November 7, 1966



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

Why China Builds Bombs At the Expense of Bread

Those whom the gods would destroy they first render complacent. China's giant strides to nuclear power represent the most important political and military development of our time. But both the great capitals challenged are doing their best to pretend nothing has happened. *Pravda*, in the prize journalistic underplay of the century, gave 16 words at the bottom of page 5 to the news that China had successfully tested a guided missile with a nuclear warhead. In Washington the *Daily News* hit the streets with a banner headline which should be preserved for the wry amusement of posterity. It said, "Red China's Missile Test Doesn't Scare Pentagon." If we had been editing that paper we would have put a second line under it, "But Pentagon's Smugness Scares Us."

Rusk's Crystal Ball Cracks Up Again

Secretary Rusk, seven days after the first Chinese nuclear explosion in 1964, assured the country that it would be "a very considerable number of years before there is anything there" i.e. in China "that would impose any serious problem." This remark should rank with his assertion in 1950 that Communist China was only a "Slavic Manchukuo", i.e. a Russian puppet state. In their fourth nuclear test in two years, the Chinese have shown that they could (1) build an operational intermediate ballistic missile, (2) perform the difficult feat of miniaturizing a nuclear warhead for it and (3) perfect the safety factor to the point where they could detonate it over their own territory. These were no small achievements. They were enough to make *Le Figaro* (Oct. 28) say that China had overtaken both England and France in the field of nuclear missiles (neither has yet tested a missile with live nuclear warhead) and must now be regarded as the No. 3 nuclear power.

Chinese nuclear capacity has been even more underestimated than was the Soviet Union's. In a Senate speech Oct. 18, just before the latest Chinese blast, Senator Jackson (*D. Wash.*) expressed surprise at "the weapons sophistication displayed" in the first three Chinese tests. The surprise in the first was the use of enriched uranium-235 instead of plutonium, which meant that the Chinese could build up a stockpile faster than expected. The surprise in the third, last May, was the use of "thermonuclear materials", which indicated that they could build H-bombs of an advanced type. The new feat, requiring a high degree of engineering competence, was accomplished faster than Secretary McNamara expected in the predictions he made

Songs The Pentagon Never Taught Them

His [the city based staff adviser] intelligence is six months old, his native wit is nil,
For him the trees teem with VC's and regiments crowd each hill,
He has no kinfolk in the woods, there's naught for him to lose,
So if in doubt he'll always shout, "Send in B-52s!"

The FAC [Forward Air Controller] rides forth to battle, a warrior without match
In his monogrammed flak jacket and his F-100 patch,
Put napalm on a hamlet and burnt the whole thing flat,
Got a thousand noncombatants and he's sorry about that.

The JG's [a Lt. Jr. grade acting as naval gunfire spotter] daily recon is the terror of the beach
As he calls for naval gunfire on everything in reach,
He sees supplies in every hootch [hut], the foe in every boat.

He's killed 100 fisherman, 12 chickens and a goat.

—From ballads the GI's sing in Vietnam, as reported in the New York Times Sunday Magazine, Oct. 30.

last December to the NATO Council. His forecast of a Chinese ICBM by 1975 may be an underestimate. "Considering the progress made in developing a nuclear missile system with an operational warhead," the famous nuclear physicist Ralph Lapp told the *Weekly*, "it would not be surprising if the Chinese could test an ICBM in two years." Senator Jackson, who is chairman of an atomic military applications subcommittee, believes China might put nuclear missiles on those of its submarines which are outfitted with tubes for surface launching of missiles. This would be enough to threaten our coastal ports. The Chinese may be able to deter us from an atomic attack on them earlier than we expected. The mere prospect will change the politics of Asia and the world.

The Chinese announcement of their nuclear missile test is too quickly being dismissed as propaganda. Much can be learned by a thoughtful reading. When they say that "at no time and in no circumstances will China be the first to use nuclear weapons," this is no more than a recognition of our nuclear superiority. All they can hope to do for many years to come is to have enough missiles to be able to inflict unac-

(Continued on Page Four)

The Pentagon Prepares The Way For A New Military Dictatorship In Santo Domingo

We're Starting to Help Balaguer The Way We Helped Diem

What little news filters through indicates that basic liberties are disappearing and trouble brewing again in the Dominican Republic. Two opposition Senators complained Oct. 19 that two radio programs, one by the 14 June Movement, the other by La Romana Sugar Mill United Union, had been suspended in their provinces in violation of constitutional rights. The radio stations which broadcast these programs were shut down to make them drop both programs. A similar and more serious incident occurred Oct. 25 when a leader of Juan Bosch's PRD was cut off the air after he criticized the government for giving land to foreign companies and the U.S. Embassy for interfering in domestic affairs.

Bosch Leaving in Protest

This was but the latest in a series of moves restricting the PRD, though it has been acting as a responsible opposition, trying to lay the foundations of a democratic society. These restrictions plus a continued right-wing terrorism which seems to have at least the tacit sympathy of police and army have created resentment inside the PRD. A substantial section of the youth has seceded and formed a democratic socialist movement. Bosch himself has broken silence to accuse the U.S. of "drastic intervention" in Dominican affairs and the Balaguer regime of repressing all political activity. Bosch has announced that he is resigning his leadership and leaving for Europe. The hope of peaceful change may go with him.

At this juncture, the Pentagon is taking steps which will make it easier to impose a military dictatorship again. An AP dispatch from Santo Domingo we saw in only one paper (*Washington Post*, Oct. 16) carried the disturbing news that the U.S. army is assigning bilingual advisers to the Dominican army "for a training program similar to the one begun in Vietnam in 1960." Though the Inter-American Force has departed, a U.S. Military Aid and Assistance Group remains. The Dominican Army will be the only one outside Vietnam to have U.S. advisers assigned to it down to the company level. The commanding officer of the U.S. mission was a military adviser in Vietnam in 1961. This should be enough to make Balaguer nervous. It certainly does us.

What the Manila Razzle-Dazzle Hid

"Manila—In an address to the National Press Club in Washington last month, President Marcos accused the previous Philippine administration of having 'coddled' the Hukbalahap guerrillas in Central Luzon. . . . Officials of the ousted Macapagal administration replied that Marco's police constabulary were shooting people just on the suspicion that they were Huks and that peasants had been 'massacred'. . . . When a sudden upsurge of Huk activity towards the middle of this year brought the Government forces into punitive action, some of the blunders that marked the early years of the Vietnam war were repeated. . . . What emerges principally from charge and counter-charge is the story of Government neglect that dates from the death of President Magsaysay in 1957. Magsaysay broke the Huks by winning the confidence of the peasants. Successive governments, having seen the Huks eliminated, did not trouble to eliminate the legitimate causes of peasant unrest."

—Denis Warner in the *London Telegraph*, Oct. 29.

The Dominican army is to be provided with enough trucks "to move to any trouble spot in the country" quickly. The AP said it is hoped thereby to prevent the sort of breakdown in communications "that paralyzed the Dominican army during the April rebellion last year." In short we are out to make sure that another revolt to reestablish constitutional government will be unsuccessful. We can see here the real meaning of military aid in Latin America. It was in just such a training program that the Trujillo dictatorship in the Dominican Republic originated. Instead of using our leverage to force Balaguer to restore political freedom, we are strengthening the "gorillas"—the military. This is Pax Americana as the Caribbean and Central America have known it for two generations.

To those who still believe military aid the best assurance of internal security we cite again the case of Costa Rica, the only securely democratic regime in Central America. It owes this to the fact that it long ago abolished its Army altogether and with it any danger of help from the U.S. military.

Will the FCC Sneak Approval of the ABC-ITT Merger While Congress Is Out of Town?

To permit ITT to acquire ABC by merger would be to hand over one of the big three TV-radio chains to the military-industrial complex. International Telephone & Telegraph is a major supplier to the military; half of its domestic income is from the government. Eighty percent of its total profits come from foreign operations in 118 countries; it is notorious in the history of our Latin American relations as a supporter of dictatorships and a beneficiary of big stick diplomacy. To let ITT take over ABC would hardly contribute, as Senator Gaylord Nelson (D. Wis.) suggested in a letter of protest to the FCC, to "the public's interest in objective news reporting."

A staff report to the Federal Communications Commission said the proposed merger "eclipses in size and surpasses in importance any other transfer of broadcast interests the Commission has yet been called upon to consider." Senator Morse warns the Commission may be planning to speed approval while Congress is out of session. Only two days of

hearings have been held by the FCC; no public spokesmen, only the two companies, have been heard. The FCC is said to be lined up 4-to-3 for the merger, and FCC Chairman Rosel Hyde has not agreed to Nelson's request that he hold up action until Justice Department has decided whether the merger is in violation of the Clayton Act.

Whether the merger is or not, the FCC has broad power to block it, for the law requires that the merger must be found to serve "the public interest, convenience and necessity." One critical member of the FCC, Nicholas Johnson, subjected one of the witnesses for the merger to sharp interrogation. He asked whether situations might not arise when ABC's desire to do a public affairs documentary might not clash with some of ITT's wide-ranging interests. "I couldn't imagine that," said the witness. He was former CIA Chief John A. McCone, named an ITT director just before the proposed merger was announced. He and Ike's old press secretary, Jim Hagerty, are its chief lobbyists.

A Document Which Discloses Trickery Behind Our UN and Manila Proposals

Not Just A Northern Withdrawal But Viet Cong "De-Activation" Demanded

Congressman Laird to Secretary McNamara Sept. 28:

"There are a number of points in Ambassador Goldberg's speech to the United Nations Sept. 22 that I found disquieting and I would appreciate your clarifying the Administration's position on them. Ambassador Goldberg stated that the U.S. 'stands ready to withdraw its forces as others withdraw theirs so peace can be restored in South Vietnam.' He later suggested 'a time schedule for supervised withdrawal from South Vietnam of all external forces—those of North Vietnam as well as those from the U.S. and other countries aiding South Vietnam.' Since this proposal specifically excludes the Viet Cong, I would like answers to the following questions:

"(1) How many troops fighting on the side of the Saigon government and how many fighting on the side of the Communists would be withdrawn?

"(2) How many troops on each side would remain in South Vietnam after the proposed withdrawal was carried out?

The Crucial Question

"(3) What is the current estimate of the Joint Chiefs of Staff regarding the ability of the South Vietnamese army to cope with Viet Cong elements which apparently would be free to continue the war?

"(4) Were the views of Joint Chiefs sought prior to Ambassador Goldberg's speech as to the military implications of this proposal?

"(5) Were our allies consulted in advance about this proposal?

"I raise the last question because of the obvious concern of the Foreign Ministers of both Thailand and Australia. Foreign Minister Thanat indicated the proposed Manila Conference had taken him by surprise. Mr. Thanat, at the UN Sept. 27, pointed out that 'many, if not all the solutions advanced by one party or another tended to favor the side which instigated the war for placing South Vietnam under its control.'

"Australia's Minister of External Affairs, Frank Hasluck, similarly warned that 'It would be dangerous to peace in the region and dangerous to world peace if hostilities ceased on unjust terms or in a way that gave encouragement to further subversive infiltration and terrorism in Southeast Asia and other parts of the world.'

Townsend Hoopes, Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense, replying for McNamara, Oct. 24:

"Your questions, which relate to Ambassador Goldberg's proposal for 'withdrawal from South Vietnam of all external forces', apparently derive from a concern that the proposal 'specifically excludes' deactivation of the Viet Cong.

"While I would agree that the proposal did not specifically address deactivation of the Viet Cong, I believe Ambassador Goldberg clearly linked the Viet Cong with North Vietnamese Army forces in this excerpt from the same speech: 'South Vietnam is under an attack, already several years old, by forces directed and supplied from the North, and reinforced by regular units—currently some 17 identified regiments—of the North Vietnamese Army.'

"To be explicit, let me assure you that the Department of

Rusk and Goldberg Misleading

We publish here today an exchange of letters between Laird of Wisconsin, chairman of the House Republican Conference, and the office of Secretary McNamara. Fragmentary newspaper reports of this exchange have missed the point. Ambassador Goldberg at the UN proposed that all "external" forces including our own be withdrawn from South Vietnam. To the Association of the U.S. Army in Washington Oct. 12, Secretary Rusk said:

"We are told that an aggression is just a 'civil war.' There is an indigenous element in the war in South Vietnam but relatively it is even smaller than was the indigenous element in the case of Greece. WE CONSIDER IT WELL WITHIN THE CAPACITY OF THE SOUTH VIETNAMESE TO HANDLE. We and others are there because of aggression from the North. . . . And we shall leave when these invaders and arms from the North go home."

But Laird's release of the reply from McNamara's office, dated 12 days after the Rusk speech, now discloses that Hanoi would not only have to withdraw Northern forces but "deactivate" the indigenous Viet Cong guerrillas in the South, i.e. get them to surrender before U.S. troops would go home.

Defense believes Ambassador Goldberg's speech includes the intent that Viet Cong military units would be deactivated in any proposed withdrawal of external forces from North Vietnam. (Italics added). In response to your specific questions:

"(1) and (2) The number of troops on each side to be withdrawn from or to remain in South Vietnam will be major items to be negotiated whenever North Vietnam can be induced to come to the conference table. The numbers arrived at will be critically dependent on the situation at the time of negotiations.

(3) As previously indicated, the Viet Cong would not be free to continue the war during any phased withdrawal of external forces. Hence, the Joint Chiefs of Staff have not addressed such a contingency.

(4) The views of the Joint Chiefs of Staff invariably are considered at the highest levels of our government on all major decisions affecting the course of the war in Vietnam. U.S. policy on Vietnam as presented to the UN was no exception to this well-established procedure.

(5) The same general guidelines applies equally to consideration of the views of our allies.

"You have quoted a portion of Thai Foreign Minister Thanat's remarks at the UN Sept. 27. He also stated, 'The Thai government and people . . . [hiatus in original] would welcome peace in Vietnam and in Southeast Asia. Any proposal for an honorable and peaceful solution to the Vietnam problem from whatever quarters will therefore be assured of our cooperation and support.' Australian Minister of External Affairs Hasluck whom you also quoted stated on the same day, 'This is not a war that can be stopped by surrender, or by a victory for either side. It can only be stopped by agreement. Our readiness to agree to cessation of fighting without any claim or penalty or gain has been plainly declared.' I hope this information will be useful to you."

Neither Washington Nor Moscow Want to Give Up Their Nuclear Advantage

(Continued from Page One)

ceptable damage on us if we make a nuclear attack on them. If they can hold two major cities like San Francisco or New York hostage in this way, that may be enough. This is also the logic of the French *force de frappe*. The idea was born when Moscow, in the Suez crisis, threatened London and Paris with nuclear missiles. The French would never dare attack Russia with their inferior nuclear force but they believe the threat that they might be able to "take out" Moscow and Kiev would be enough to deter Russia from making a nuclear attack on France. The Chinese are talking sober nuclear strategy when they say their weapons are "entirely for defense." If they can build enough nuclear strength to neutralize ours, we could only wage conventional war against them. There they have the advantage of their huge manpower and their readiness to fall back on a guerrilla "people's war." These are assets which can be used on the defensive only, but the combination would make China impregnable to successful attack. This is the strategic meaning of the Chinese missile and this is what makes it irrelevant for President Johnson to warn the Chinese as he did in Malaysia Oct. 30 that any nuclear potential they may acquire will be counterbalanced by our superior power. The Chinese do not need to match us to deter us.

The Opportunity We Lost

The lesson of the Chinese missile is that to stop the proliferation of nuclear weapons is a political, not a technological problem. When a nation as poor as China can develop the nuclear missile so quickly, it should be clear that they are no longer available only to large rich nations. To stop the spread of nuclear weapons requires some means of guaranteeing the smaller powers security without them. Now is the time to recall those occasions in the late 50s and 60s when China appealed to us in vain for a nuclear-free Pacific, and for a pledge that nuclear weapons would not be used against non-nuclear powers. That was the time to stop the Chinese nuclear missile.

The Chinese demand then is the same demand being made now by some 40 non-nuclear powers in the current debate

Running Short of Pilots in the Air War

Washington, Oct. 29 (AP)—The loss of at least 24 war plane pilots in the fire this week aboard the USS Oriskany has added to the Navy shortage of aircraft carrier attack pilots. The Navy now is operating with about 2,000 carrier pilots, 750 short. Even before the Oriskany fire the Navy had estimated that at present attrition rates, by early 1968 it would be necessary to reduce the number of combat missions over North Vietnam or order fliers to serve beyond the present limit of two 6-month tours. . . . Many pilots have been flying 2 combat sorties a day . . . sometimes for 10 days in a row. Adding to the problem is the heavier pilot loss rate. . . . One officer said the amount of anti-aircraft fire doubled between last Fall and this May. Since May, he added, it has tripled.

—Baltimore Sun, Oct. 30.

over non-proliferation at the UN General Assembly. They are unwilling to renounce nuclear weapons unless the nuclear powers, in the words of the resolution, "give an assurance that they will not use, or threaten to use, nuclear weapons against non-nuclear weapon states." Neither the Warsaw Pact powers nor the NATO powers are supporting this resolution. This is why the Ambassador of India was so bitter in his speech at the UN Oct. 31. India is not disposed to sign a non-proliferation treaty unless the big powers agree to stop expanding the vast nuclear arsenals at their disposal. India wants nuclear arms and their delivery vehicles reduced and then eliminated. It wants nuclear renunciation to be mutual, and not for smaller powers only. Even if nuclear "umbrellas" are offered the smaller powers, it would be at the price of lost independence and the risk of deals made over their heads. It must seem hypocritical to the smaller powers for Johnson to say, as he did in Malaysia, that they would be making bombs at the expense of bread. To them this may seem the price of survival in the nuclear jungle. Our bombing of North Vietnam gives them a taste of what the defenceless may expect.

(Next Week: Is The Anti-Missile The Way Out?)

We'll Be Glad to Send A Sample Copy of This Issue To A Friend — Send A Stamped Addressed Envelope Also PLEASE Send in Your Zip Numbers Urgent

I. F. Stone's Weekly 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed \$5:

Name

Street

City Zip..... State.....

11/7/66

For the enclosed \$5 send a gift sub to:

(To) Name

Street

City Zip..... State.....

For \$5.35 extra send I. F. Stone's *The Haunted Fifties*

Indicate if announcement wished ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

Second class

postage paid

at

Washington, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except in August, the last week in December and the first week in January and Bi-Weekly during July at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: \$5 in the U.S.; \$6 in Canada; \$10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: \$15 to Europe; \$20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.